

# **Will Manitoba Taxpayers Consent to Pay for Roman Catholic Separate Schools?**

By

**T. T. SHIELDS**

**Price Twenty-Five Cents**

Published by

**THE GOSPEL WITNESS**

130 Gerrard St. East

**TORONTO 2, CANADA**

100

101

102

103

104

C. ERIC KASTNER

*R. R. Roatch*  
22/6/84

# An Address on Roman Catholic Separate Schools

by

DR. T. T. SHIELDS, of Toronto

*Delivered in*

THE CIVIC AUDITORIUM  
WINNIPEG, MANITOBA

**Thursday Evening, November 6th, 1952**

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

I am here this evening to speak on the subject announced for my address, in response to an invitation by a Committee of Winnipeg citizens. That Committee has nothing to do with Norwood, nor have I any acquaintance, directly or indirectly with anyone in Norwood, nor have I had any communication with anyone there. While the occasion for their protest against the action of the Norwood Public School Board, in respect to the two Parochial Schools, known as the School of the Holy Cross, and of the Precious Blood, is a local matter, and, primarily, concerns the rate-payers of this city, in principle it is a problem which is not only Dominion-wide, but as wide as the world.

## **The Famous "Manitoba School Question"**

It will be known to those who are old enough to remember, and to others who have informed themselves on Manitoba's political and educational history, that a matter known as "The Manitoba School Question" just about at the turn of the century, rocked this whole Dominion, as by an earthquake, from Halifax to Victoria.

For the information of those who may belong to neither of these two categories, let me briefly state the case:

## **BUT WHAT ABOUT MANITOBA?**

Manitoba was part of the North West Territories when the British North America Act was passed. It was later erected as a Province, but its status in the Dominion was exactly the same as if it had been a partner to the British North America Act.

### **“The Manitoba School Question”**

In 1895 or thereabout the Manitoba Legislature abolished Roman Catholic Separate Schools in Manitoba. They had never been quite like the Separate Schools of Ontario. But they were schools in which special privileges were exercised by the Roman Catholic Church. But the schools were not abolished on religious grounds, but because they were educationally incompetent.

The Roman Catholic Hierarchy appealed to the Supreme Court of Canada for redress, and the Supreme Court held that the authority (in this case the Manitoba Legislature) which had granted the privilege of Separate Schools, was competent to withdraw it. The question was then appealed to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in London, and that Body held that in the event of any grievance on the part of the minority an appeal did lie to the Federal Authority in Ottawa under the British North America Act; and that in such case the Federal Authority “may” not *must* grant redress, which is to say that the British North America Act was not mandatory in the matter.

But within this framework such redress was permissible, that is to say, the Federal Authority was competent to pass a law imposing Separate Schools on Manitoba notwithstanding their abolition by the Manitoba Legislature.

### **What Ottawa Proposed**

At this time the Conservative Party in Ottawa was in a moribund condition. The great chieftain, Sir John A. Macdonald, had passed on. He had been followed by one or two others, one of whom, Sir John Thompson, was also deceased. The Party, thinking to make capital of the School Question, and gain the support of Quebec, did two things: They brought Sir Charles Tupper, one of the Fathers of

Confederation, back from the High Commissionership in London, and made him the Leader of the Party, and therefore Premier; and then they introduced a Remedial Bill, which would have forced Separate Schools upon Manitoba. Wilfred Laurier was the Liberal Leader, and a Roman Catholic. He opposed the Remedial Bill, and said he believed in Provincial rights; and Manitoba, having acted as it did, should not be coerced. His decision was hailed by the majority of Protestants all over the country, and they assumed that a French-Canadian Leader had arisen who actually believed in liberty.

### **The "Remedial Bill" Was Talked to Death**

Parliament was dissolved and election called, which was fought on the merits of "The Manitoba School Question".

This Editor was very young at the time, but being profoundly interested in all such matters, he studied every aspect of it diligently, and, young as he was, he set his opinion against his elders, saying that Wilfred Laurier had entered into a compact with the Hierarchy, and that he would yet do far more from principle for the Roman Catholic Church than Sir Charles Tupper would have done for mere policy.

### **The North West Territories**

We had our eye on the North West Territories before the Provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan were erected. But Wilfred Laurier was returned with a great majority, and we recall meeting a jubilant Baptist Minister the day after the election who seemed to think all the world ought to be happy at Laurier's victory. We met him in a street car. He had a copy of *The Toronto Globe* in his hand. Surprised that we did not share his elation, we asked him to let us have the paper for a moment. We turned to the election returns, and showed him that Wilfred Laurier had been elected by a virtually solid Quebec, and that, against the public pronouncement of the Hierarchy. He remarked that it was an evidence of the emancipation of Quebec. We remember that we laughed at his credulity, and said, "Wait and see."

## **The New Provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta**

At a later date, when the new Provinces, Saskatchewan and Alberta, were erected, in the original draft of the "Autonomy Bill", Sir Wilfred Laurier, as he then had become, incorporated an Educational Clause, which provided for separate Roman Catholic education from the kindergarten to the university. Of course, it was modified before passage, but the principle was admitted.

### **A London By-Election in 1905**

We fought the Public Works Minister on that issue in London, Ont., at a by-election. He sent for this Editor, and we had a three-hour discussion with him, in which he admitted that Laurier brought in his Autonomy Bills as the first measure after his second election, although no word had been spoken of it until he was in power again. And this Cabinet Minister, the Honourable Charles Hyman, said that Laurier came into the Cabinet, put down these Bills, and insisted upon obedience on the part of all the Cabinet, declaring that unless he was supported he would resign. They had all just come through an election at great expense, and did not want another, and so they capitulated, and the Separate School principle was fastened upon these two great Provinces.

### **Our Prophecy Fulfilled**

Our prophecy was completely fulfilled. Laurier was under contract to the Quebec Hierarchy, which means the Roman Catholic Canadian Hierarchy, by which he agreed to yield the "postage stamp" Province of Manitoba, and he would then give them an empire in the two new Provinces.

### **WHAT IS NOW HAPPENING?**

The vast wealth being developed in the West will attract settlers and capital from all over the world. Separate Schools will spring up like mushrooms. Groups of displaced persons will be brought from Europe and settled in Roman Catholic centres, and all the feuds of Europe with their consequent wretchedness, will be transplanted to this Dominion.

### **Winnipeg Matter Only a Feeler**

This matter in Manitoba, and in Winnipeg is only a "feeler", it is a symptom. It is a further step in the West toward making Canada a Roman Catholic Republic.

### **What Lord Bennett Predicted**

On the occasion of his last visit to Canada the late Lord Bennett called at THE GOSPEL WITNESS office, having first telephoned for an appointment, and he said, "Dr. Shields, I know Canada. I know it politically, and I know that a movement is on foot to separate Canada from the British Empire and the British Commonwealth, to make it a separate Roman Catholic Republic." And he added, "With my full knowledge of Canada, I can see nothing in prospect that can avert ultimate civil war in this country." We do not agree with Lord Bennett at that point, although we do agree that such a matter is in contemplation. That, we venture to believe is the explanation of the Military Academy set up in the Province of Quebec. But if such a dreadful situation should come to pass, it will not be effected by a Roman Catholic majority, but docilely permitted by a lethargic, indifferent, pusillanimous Protestant majority. We should not say "Protestants", but use a broader term, and say that if non-Catholics could now be aroused to the menace which threatens us, we may be able to settle the matter by ballots to-day instead of by bullets to-morrow.

### **Some Implications of the Norwood School Board's Action**

I shall try this evening, if you will have patience with me, to show what is involved in the decision of the Norwood School Board, and why the Parochial Schools requested their inclusion in the Norwood Public School, and by what means they effected their purpose.

I have carefully examined the Minutes of the School Board relating to this matter. A member of the Citizens' Committee was informed that the reason for the Parochial

Schools' overtures was two-fold — they were overcrowded, and the financial burden was too great. But both reasons amount to the same thing: the Parochial School Board wanted more room for their pupils, provided at public expense; and some relief from their financial burden in maintaining their separate religious schools.

### **Separate Schools in Disguise**

Stripped of all disguises, what they have asked is that the teachers in the Separate Schools shall be retained, and their salaries paid by those who are taxed for the support of Public Schools; in other words, that they should continue to do the work of Separate Schools under the financial aegis of the Public School System, and at public expense.

Any one at all conversant with this matter — for this is a trick which is being worked in hundreds of cases in the Province of Ontario — will know that the stipulations which were the basis of the agreement between the two School Boards, in their actual outworking will mean nothing at all. Religious instruction will not be confined to the period set out in the Manitoba School Act, for the nuns, in the nature of the case, must teach whatever they teach from a Roman Catholic point of view, and all their teaching, of necessity will be coloured with Roman Catholicism.

### **About Religious Symbols**

Is anyone so naive as to suppose that the seventh clause, "the display of religious symbols in the said two schools shall not conflict with the regulations laid down in the Public Schools Act"? This memorandum was submitted on August 12th. It was modified to read, "The display of religious symbols shall be limited to the time of religious periods". As in all other Separate Schools, crucifixes and portraits, or statuettes of the Virgin and Child, and other Roman Catholic symbols, will find their place. Does anyone suppose that they all will be carefully removed at the termination of the period of religious instruction, and then



once again restored to their place? They will be there all the time.

### **Who Will Control the Schools?**

In the first draft this sentence occurred:

“Final control in any matter shall rest with the Norwood School Board”;

but in the ultimate agreement that clause was struck out by a motion to this effect:

“Mr. McGurran finally Moved, seconded by Mr. Hague and carried:—THAT the working agreement from the parochial schools, as outlined in Minutes of August 12th, be now accepted, with the following amendments:—

Clause 4 — the last sentence reading “Final control in any matter shall rest with the Norwood School Board” be struck out.

Clause 5 — be entirely eliminated.

Clause 7 — shall be made to read — “The display of religious symbols in the said two schools be limited to time of religious periods.”

“THAT the Norwood School Board acknowledge the letter of August 20th, 1952, received from the Holy Cross and Precious Blood School Boards, and that they be advised that their offers therein be accepted to be effective at the earliest possible date; their schools to become a part of the Norwood School Board as Public Schools—and further that the working agreement as presented to the Norwood School Board be amended to read as follows:—

- “1. Teachers employed to teach in the Holy Cross and Precious Blood Schools shall be qualified teachers and shall become members of the Manitoba Teachers Society.
- “2. Salaries paid teachers in the said two schools shall be in accordance with the existing salary schedule.
- “3. The Norwood School Board shall be reimbursed by the groups at present supporting the said two schools for any difference between the net teachers' grants and the schedule rates of pay.
- “4. Administration of the said two schools, including the hiring of teachers and the allocation of pupils, shall be the responsibility of the Norwood School Board. It is agreed that Protestant teachers may teach and Protestant pupils may attend the said two schools.

- "5. Religious instruction in the said two schools shall be confined to the period provided for in the Public Schools Act.
- "6. The display of religious symbols shall be limited to the time of religious periods.
- "7. The said two schools shall be leased to the Norwood School Board at a yearly rental of \$1.00.
- "8. The maintenance and operating expenses of the said two schools shall be paid by the groups at present supporting the said two schools.
- "9. This agreement shall not increase the cost to the Norwood School District one cent.

"Mr. Wilson then moved, seconded by Mr. Hague— THAT the Department of Education be advised the Norwood School Board has entered into agreement with the Holy Cross and Precious Blood School Boards by the resolution just passed by the Board, and if there is anything in this agreement contrary to the Manitoba Public School Act, that the Norwood School Board be advised. Carried.

It will be observed the agreement stipulates that "Teachers employed to teach in the Holy Cross and Precious Blood schools shall be qualified teachers, and shall become members of the Manitoba Teachers' Society."

What the "qualifications" shall be are not named in the agreement: but in the Manitoba School Act it is stipulated:

"'Teacher' means a person who holds a valid and subsisting teacher's certificate or a limited teaching permit issued under the Education Department Act, or who is authorized by the minister to teach in a school."  
(*Emphasis mine*)

It will be seen from this that under the Act anybody authorized by the Minister to teach in a school becomes legally a qualified teacher. All that is necessary is that the Hierarchy should inform the Minister that in their judgment certain teachers are fully qualified to do the work required of them for Roman Catholic pupils, and the Minister may put his rubber stamp upon it, and they become "qualified teachers". In other words the agreement means nothing at all, for once they are thus certified, the religious teachers of the Parochial Schools would have freedom to do as they liked.

It has been demonstrated in numerous cases in the Province of Ontario that Separate Schools are not absorbed by the Public School, but that the Public School is absorbed by the Separate School.

### **Further Minutes of the Norwood School Board**

Reading the Minutes of the Norwood School Board, though the names of the members were to me only names, and I had not then been given any information on the subject, I identified Mr. McGurran and Mr. Wilson and Mr. Hague as Roman Catholics.

### **A Press Report**

In a press report of October 15th, we read:

"Mr. McIntyre then read a three-page statement in which he accused Mr. Wilson of creating dissension on the Board. 'Since he was elected to the Board, he does what he wants, and the way he wants it done'.

"'At one meeting he told us he was elected to buck this Board' Mr. McIntyre continued."

There is another quotation I should like to make from the same press report:

"Mr. McGurran: 'It has been brought to my attention that certain people in this community have written a very, very nasty letter to post to members of the community. Anyone that criticizes any member of the Board had better be on pretty safe ground.'"

I would assure Mr. McGurran that in criticizing members of the Norwood School Board I shall place myself on very safe ground. I shall, of course, be called "narrow" and "bigoted" in what I now say:

When an Anglican, a United Churchman, a Presbyterian, a Baptist, a Salvationist, or a Jew, or anybody else, is elected to public office, he accepts the position as affording an opportunity to render public service. When a Roman Catholic is elected to public office, be it a Public School Board, a High School Board, a City Council, a Provincial Legislature, or the House of Commons, he goes there with full instruction to use his office to further the

interests of the Roman Catholic Church. And because every "faithful" Romanist, as they call them, is obliged to obey the priest on pain of purgatorial, or infernal, punishment; and because the priest is similarly compelled to obey his bishop, the bishop the cardinal, and the cardinal, the Pope; and because the Pope calls himself the king of kings, and is the Head of a Foreign State, and is bound by no law, but the law of his Church, and therefore is not subject to any temporal power on earth, it follows in the nature of the case that a truly "faithful" Roman Catholic in any public office he may hold, will subordinate all interests to the interest of the Church; and for that reason no "faithful" Roman Catholic in any free country in the world, should be entrusted with public office.

## JOHN WESLEY ON TOLERATION

### Toleration of Romanism

The following appeared in the *Public Advertiser* in 1780, and now that public attention is drawn to this subject, in connection with Parliamentary and other matters, the letter will be read with special interest:—

"Sir: Some time ago a pamphlet was sent me, entitled, 'An Appeal from the Protestant Association to the People of Great Britain'. A day or two since a kind of answer to this was put into my hand, which pronounces 'its style contemptible, its reasoning futile, and its object malicious'. On the contrary, I think the style of it clear, easy, and natural; the reasoning in general strong and conclusive; the object or design kind and benevolent. And in pursuance of this kind and benevolent design—namely, to preserve our happy Constitution—I shall endeavour to confirm the substance of that tract by a few plain arguments. With persecution I have nothing to do. I persecute no man for his religious principles. Let there be as 'boundless a freedom in religion' as any man can conceive. But this does not touch the point. I will set religion, true or false, utterly out of the question. Suppose the Bible, if you please, to be a fable, and the Koran to be the Word of God. I consider not whether the Romish religion be true or false; I build nothing on one or the other supposition. Therefore,

away with all common-place declamation about intolerance and persecution for religion! Suppose every word of Pope Pius' creed to be true; suppose the Council of Trent to have been infallible; yet I insist that no Government not Roman Catholic ought to tolerate men of the Roman Catholic persuasion. I prove this by a plain argument (let him answer it that can). That no Roman Catholic does or can give security for his allegiance or peaceable behaviour, I prove thus: It is a Roman Catholic maxim, established, not by private men, but by a public council, that 'No faith is to be kept with heretics'. This has been openly avowed by the Council of Constance; but it never was openly disclaimed. Whether private persons avow or disavow it, it is a fixed maxim of the Church of Rome. But, as long as it is so, it is plain that the members of that Church can give no reasonable security to any government of their allegiance or peaceable behaviour. Therefore they ought not to be tolerated by any Government—Protestant, Mohammedan, or Pagan. You may say, 'Nay, but they will take an oath of allegiance'. True, five hundred oaths; but the maxim, 'No faith is to be kept with heretics', sweeps them all away as a spider's web. So that still no governors that are not Roman Catholics can have any security of their allegiance. Again, those who acknowledge the spiritual power of the Pope can give no security for their allegiance to any Government; but all Roman Catholics acknowledge this; therefore they can give no security for their allegiance. The power of granting pardon for all sins, past, present, and to come, is, and has been for many centuries, one branch of his special power. But those who acknowledge him to have this spiritual power can give no security for their allegiance, since they believe the Pope can pardon rebellions, high treason, and all other sins whatsoever. The power of dispensing with any promise, oath, or vow, is another branch of the spiritual power of the Pope. And all who acknowledge his spiritual power must acknowledge this. But whoever acknowledges the dispensing power of the Pope can give no security for his allegiance to any Government. Oaths and promises are none; they are light as air; a dispensation makes them all null and void. Nay,

not only the Pope, but even a priest can forgive sins! This is an essential doctrine of the Church of Rome. But they that acknowledge this, cannot possibly give any security for their allegiance to any Government. Oaths are no security at all; for the priest can pardon both perjury and high treason. Setting, then, religion aside, it is plain that, upon principles of reason, no Government ought to tolerate men who cannot give any security to that Government for their allegiance and peaceable behaviour. But this no Romanist can do, not only while he holds that 'no faith is to be kept with heretics', but so long as he acknowledges either priestly absolution or the spiritual power of the Pope. 'But the late Act' (you say) 'does not either tolerate or encourage Roman Catholics'. I appeal to matter of fact. Do not the Romanists themselves understand it as a toleration? You know they do. And does it not already (let alone what it may do by and by) encourage them to preach openly, to build chapels (at Bath and elsewhere), to raise seminaries, and to make numerous converts day by day to their intolerant, persecuting principles? I can point out, if need be, several of the persons. And they are increasing daily. 'But nothing dangerous to English liberty is to be apprehended from them'. I am not certain of that. Some time since a Romish priest came to one I knew; and, after talking with her largely, broke out, 'You are no heretic; you have the experience of a real Christian'. 'And would you' she asked, 'burn me alive?' He said, 'God forbid! unless it were for the good of the Church'. Now what security could she have had for her life, if it had depended on that man? The good of the Church would have burst all ties of truth, justice, and mercy; specially when seconded by the absolution of a priest, or (if need were) a papal pardon.

"If any one please to answer this, and set his name, I shall probably reply. But the productions of anonymous writers I do not promise to take notice of.

I am, Sir,

Your humble servant,

"John Wesley".

---

"City Road, January 21st, 1780."

The behaviour of these Public School Trustees is symptomatic of the machinations of Rome everywhere. When they were nominated for office one may be sure beyond all possibility of doubt that all the "faithful" having votes, were secretly instructed to vote to put them on the School Board, and very probably to vote for no one else. And back of the Roman Catholic Hierarchy in this city stands the Roman Catholic Hierarchy in the Dominion, and this raid upon the treasury of the Public Schools in Winnipeg, and the plan to integrate the Roman Catholic Schools in our Public School System, is part of a concerted plan being carried out throughout the Dominion to compel all the taxpayers of this country to pay for the propagation of the tenets of Rome.

### A Roman Catholic Archbishop

The attitude of the Roman Church toward the election of trustees who are to control education was some years ago set out by Archbishop Lynch in a pastoral letter, who stated as follows:

"It is quite erroneous to think what appertains to the election of Separate School trustees is merely a secular matter and does not touch religion. The Christian education of youth is a religious matter, only to be chiefly directed by the clergy, and especially by the bishops . . . Now the election of persons to aid the clergy in their sacred duty of educating youth is a sacred matter.

**"The church justly and religiously claims the right to define the bounds of her own rights and jurisdiction . . . Now we pronounce that the election of Separate School trustees is a religious affair, and that each elector must answer before God for his vote.**

**"We never tried to control our Catholic people in their votes for purely secular concerns, such as for election of mayor, or of alderman, or of members of parliament, etc., but the election of a Separate School trustee, being a religious matter, concerning the salvation of souls, it is our duty to interfere and see that proper men are elected."** (*Emphasis mine*)

If this means anything, it means first that the Hierarchy here arrogates to itself the right above the State to decide educational matters, and secondly takes away from Sepa-

rate School voters the democratic right of freedom in voting. If the bishop and clergy have power to select school boards by coercing their people to vote for their candidates, democracy has been replaced by autocracy. In the Norwood School case, having in mind their purpose to integrate the two Parochial Schools with the Public School, the election of Public School trustees would be just as much "a religious matter concerning the salvation of souls" as the election of Separate School trustees; hence the membership of men like Mr. McGurran and Mr. Wilson on the Norwood Public School Board.

The notorious Edwin Alonzo Boyd, the gangster sent to Kingston Penitentiary for life, who had robbed many banks of an aggregate of more than one hundred thousand dollars, asked why he did it, said he wanted money to buy a house. Ask why no Roman Catholic priest of any rank in all the Dominion of Canada pays one dollar of income tax? Ask why Roman Catholics are put forward for School Boards, and High School Boards, and village and City Councils, and other public offices? The answer is, They want to build up the Roman Catholic Church.

If any should be offended by the mention of a man like Boyd in this connotation, I can only say that the "Boyd gang", who rightly now are lodged in Kingston Penitentiary, were an association of gentlemen compared with some organizations I could name, who steal, not hundreds of thousands, but millions of dollars from the Public Treasury; and the threat of a block of Roman Catholic votes to secure their end, is not much less culpable than a loaded revolver.

It is useless to discuss the legality of any matter of dispute with the Roman Church, for the reason that the Church claims to be above all kings and princes, and that the State is subordinate to the Church. Here is what Pius IX in his famous Syllabus says (VI. Section 54) :

"Kings and Princes are not only not exempt from the jurisdiction of the Church, but are subordinate to the Church in litigated questions of jurisdiction."



### **The Head of the Canadian R.C. Hierarchy**

But we need not go as far back as Pius IX. The Head of the Roman Catholic Hierarchy in Canada, Cardinal Villeneuve, said:

"It is never permitted . . . to grant freedom of thought, writing, or teaching, and the undifferentiated freedom of religions, as so many rights which nature has given to man."

Cardinal Villeneuve in reply to a protest from the Civil Liberties' Union, against mob violence in Montreal, wrote as follows:

"Freedom of speech, yes, but not freedom to insult our social conceptions, our traditions, our morals and our religion. Freedom of speech, I am for it, but let it be among decent people, not among imbeciles and brigands . . . . Would you let sufferers from contagious diseases poison the air you breathe? . . . Together with his Excellency the Archbishop-Coadjutor of Montreal, I praise the youth which aligns itself to protect special order . . .

"If it is argued that this is contrary to law, I reply that before law there is the Law of Nature . . . Well, to defend ourselves against subversive doctrines, against spiritual poisoning, against the overthrow of the foundations of civilization, against the dynamite which would blow up our religious, family and social traditions, if that is not the law, let that law be made; if not, we shall exercise the law and right of nature. 'The safety of the people is the supreme law' . . . Under pretext of respecting a morbid democracy, people wave at us the spectre of all illusory Fascism, and meanwhile the enemies gain a foothold and make a mockery of our juridical scruples."

It was Cardinal Villeneuve who gave orders that Bibles were to be burned. It was Cardinal Villeneuve, in a pastoral letter, who instructed his clergy to withhold the sacraments of the Church from parents who, against the Church's order, sent their children to non-Catholic or neutral schools.

Thus the Head of the Hierarchy says that if their conduct be contrary to law, then the law must be made to conform to their conduct; and if there be no such law made, then they will appeal to the law of nature, and do their own will in spite of the law.

As late as 1930 we had this:

*"It is the duty of the State to help the (Roman Catholic) Church maintain its religious schools by aid from public funds, and equally the duty of all (Roman) Catholics — as an act of religion — to demand that the State perform this duty."*

—Encyclical of Pope Pius XI, 1930.

In the Norwood School case, it is proposed to integrate two Parochial Schools into the Public School System; notwithstanding the Church describes such schools as "god-less", and that parents are forbidden to send their children even to schools where Protestants and Romanist children attend. The Roman Catholic children are not to be allowed to mix with Protestant children.

### Cardinal Villeneuve on "Neutral" or "Mixed" Schools

Cardinal Villeneuve in the *Semaine Religieuse de Quebec*, said:

**"It is my duty to recall that Catholic children are not allowed, according to the laws of the Church, to attend schools which are non-Catholic, neutral or mixed, that is to say, which are even open to non-Catholics. (c'est-a-dire ouvertes même aux non-catholiques).**

"Indeed if we but remind ourselves for a moment that schools, even more than institutions of learning, are homes of education, that is to say, of moral formation, we shall understand why Catholics cannot find in non-Catholic schools the atmosphere which is suitable for the conservation of their piety and the practice of Christian virtues; and this is true even on the supposition that neutral or non-Catholic institutions do not carry on religious proselytism and give evidence of sympathy to the Church. It is no offense to make this observation.

"Catholic parents who reflect will be quickly convinced. Just as a plant does not thrive outside its own climate, so the religious sentiment of a child runs a strong risk of becoming weakened or even exhausted in a school neutral or foreign to its faith. An unhappy experience has long since proved it to be so. That is the reason why the church is so severe in this matter. Catholic parents, or those who take their place, if they knowingly educate or instruct their children in a non-Catholic religion thereby incur excommuni-

cation at the discretion of the Bishop, (Canon 2319, paragraph 1, 40), and will moreover fall under suspicion of heresy, (paragraph 2.) The Church also forbids Catholic children to attend non-Catholic, neutral or mixed schools because of the danger of perversion that they may run and it reserves to the Bishop the care of decreeing, in accordance with the instructions of the Holy See, in what circumstances and at the cost of what precaution the thing may be tolerated, always in such a way as to prevent the danger of perversion. (Canon 1374).

In England, for example, and in the United States and in several provinces of the Dominion, Catholics must make the greatest sacrifices and even sustain the most ardent struggles in order to have their own schools where they may send their children without damage to their beliefs and to their religious practices. In our province, thanks be to God, Catholics have the immense advantage of organizing all their schools according to the dictates of their own conscience.

"In view of this, reasons of a natural order are not sufficient to excuse parents for exposing their children to the danger of weakening or losing their faith.

"If in very special cases, young people who have passed the age of childhood are under the necessity of attending non-Catholic institutions they must first obtain the permission of the Bishop. This permission in our diocese must be requested through the parish priest with strong reasons to support it: it will not be given except on condition that the parish priest or one of his workers may watch over the religious instruction and the moral conduct of these young people. This toleration will be given for not longer than one year at a time and it will be necessary to make a new request each year, if the reasons on which it is based should continue. (Diocesan Synod Decree 451, par'1).

**"To parents, who, having been duly warned, continue to send their children to a non-Catholic school without the permission of the bishop, confessors must refuse absolution. (Diocesan Discipline, art. 454, b)**

Quebec the 31st of August, 1942.

J. M. Rodrigue Villeneuve, O.M.I.

Archbishop of Quebec."

### ***The Freeman, (R.C.) of Kingston***

This is what a Canadian Roman Catholic journal had to say in respect to the Public Schools of Ontario:

**"The Ontario Public School system is 'all wrong,'  
It is a grave injustice and a menace to Canada. It is**

*responsible for training of hosts of infidels. Why the souls of countless children should be slaughtered in such schools without a reasonable effort to overcome the appalling evil passes our comprehension."*

*(Emphasis mine)*

Again, as late as 1934 the Roman Catholic paper, *The Freeman*, of Kingston, said:

"Outside of the Catholic schools, we have had education without religion. And the EVIL SYSTEM is bearing the inevitable fruit. With God cast out of education, the schools (PUBLIC SCHOOLS) began to prepare students for unchristian principles."

### **A Campaign to Convert Public Schools into Separate Schools**

But not content with the attempt to establish Roman Catholic Separate Schools everywhere, to be maintained at public expense, for some time the Hierarchy have been conducting a campaign actually to convert Public Schools into Roman Catholic Separate Schools, to be maintained at public expense:

If further proof of the designs and campaign of the Roman Catholic Separate School authorities is needed, we quote a statement of Rev. Father Arthur Joyal, Secretary of the French-Canadian Education Association, speaking in Windsor, Ontario, on January 24th, 1937, and reported in the Windsor Star:

"A PUBLIC SCHOOL is not necessarily a neutral or Protestant school. IT CAN BECOME A (ROMAN) CATHOLIC SCHOOL. If the school supporters are (Roman) Catholic, there is nothing to prevent teachers reciting prayers, JUST AS IF THEY WERE IN A SEPARATE SCHOOL . . . WE WILL ATTACK THE IMPORTANT TASK OF CONVERTING THESE (PUBLIC) SCHOOLS INTO ROMAN CATHOLIC SEPARATE SCHOOLS."

This, of course, is exactly what is being done in the Norwood Public School. It is not intended to unite two schools under one roof. By the agreement, control of the administration was wrested from the Trustees of the Public School, and the intention is that it should pass entirely to the Hierarchy through their representatives.

### **In What Respect Are Separate Schools Superior?**

Now in what respect are Separate Schools superior? It is a matter of history that they were abolished in Manitoba, because they failed in their educational purpose. They were, educationally, inefficient.

What is the record of the Separate School System? "By their fruits ye shall know them."

### **The Fruits of a R.C. School System**

But what are fruits of a school system completely dominated by the Church? We quote from an official Dominion Government publication, "Illiteracy and School Attendance, Census monograph No. 5", based on the 1931 census, as follows: The percentage of illiterate male population ten years of age and over in the two provinces is as follows:

Ontario .....	2.71
Quebec .....	6.21

Startling as the figures are, they do not tell the whole story, as there are many French-Canadians in Ontario, and many English-Canadians in Quebec. Hence the following statistics for the whole of Canada give a truer picture of the fruits of a Roman Catholic school system. The percentage of illiterates in Canada (ten years of age and over) :

British races .....	0.88
French .....	6.18

### **Seven Times the Illiteracy Among R.Cs. as Among Protestants**

This means that French Roman Catholicism produces approximately seven times as many illiterates as are found

among those of British extraction, the majority of whom are Protestants.

### **Provincial Hierarchy of Quebec**

The fifth Provincial Council of the Hierarchy held at Quebec in 1873, declared:

“We assert that the Church is a perfect Society, independent of the Civil power and Superior to it. Between the religious authority of this Society (the fulness of which authority resides in the Roman Pontiff) and the political power of the Christian ruler there exists, from the very nature of things, such a relation, that the latter is to the former not only negatively but also positively subordinate, although indirectly so. The Civil power can do nothing which tends to the injury of the Church, and ought to abstain from such acts as would clash with the laws of the Church, and, indeed, should also, at the request of the Church, co-operate toward its benefit and the attainment of its supernatural end. This is the true doctrine of Boniface the Eighth, in the Bull *Unam Sanctam*, in which he teaches that the material sword should be subordinate to the spiritual sword, and should be used for the Church, but not against the Church. The opinion of the Fathers is the same who write that the Civil power has been instituted by God for the protection and care of the Church.”

### **Why Are Public Schools Called “Godless”?**

But what does the Roman Catholic mean by calling our schools “godless”? The fact is, of course, that any school, or any other institution which does not recognize the supremacy of the Pope, is a “godless” institution. Here is the proof of it:

### **Bishop Bourget**

Bishop Bourget at the fifth provincial conference of the Hierarchy held in Quebec in eighteen-seventy-three said:

“Each one of you can and ought to say in the interior of his soul, ‘I hear my Curé; my Curé hears the Bishop; the Bishop hears the Pope, and the Pope

hears our Lord Jesus Christ, who aids with His Holy Spirit, to render them infallible on the teaching and government of His Church.' ”

### **Sir Wilfred Laurier on Separate Schools**

In the discussions in connection with the erection of the Provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta, Sir Wilfred Laurier plainly said that the purpose of the Separate School was to inculcate the tenets of the Roman Catholic Church.

### **But What Does the R.C. Church Do for the State?**

It is not now possible to obtain any official statement showing the religious affiliations of the inmates of Canadian penitentiaries. I have to go back twenty years to get my figures. There may be some later tabulation, but I have not been able to find it. Here are the facts:

### **Penitentiary Population in 1931**

According to the census of nineteen hundred and thirty-one the total population of the Dominion was ten million three hundred and seventy-six thousand seven hundred and eighty-six, of which four million two hundred and eighty-five thousand three hundred and eighty-eight were Roman Catholics, or a Roman Catholic percentage of forty-one decimal thirty per cent to the whole population. For the year nineteen hundred and thirty-one the penitentiary population of the Dominion was three thousand seven hundred and fourteen, of whom one thousand eight hundred and ten were Roman Catholics. Again, but a fraction less than fifty per cent of the penitentiary population was Roman Catholic, while the total Roman Catholic population of the Dominion was only forty-one per cent.

About the same proportion to the population obtains in practically all penitentiaries; and it is a matter of common observation that the great majority of the worst criminals, including those who are sentenced to the gallows, almost invariably have Roman Catholic priests for their “spiritual advisers”.

### What "The Church" Does for the State When in the Ascendancy

We may inquire, What does the Roman Catholic Church do for a State in which it gains the ascendancy? Lord Macaulay, who was no bigot, in his *History of England*, published a little over a hundred years ago, wrote as follows:

"During the last three centuries, to stunt the growth of the human mind has been her chief object. Throughout Christendom, whatever advance has been made in knowledge, in freedom, in wealth, and in the arts of life, has been made in spite of her, and has everywhere been in inverse proportion to her power. The loveliest and most fertile provinces of Europe have, under her rule, been sunk in poverty, in political servitude, and in intellectual torpor, while Protestant countries, once proverbial for sterility and barbarism, have been turned by skill and industry into gardens, that can boast of a long list of heroes and statesmen, philosophers and poets. Whoever, knowing what Italy and Scotland naturally are, and what, four hundred years ago, they actually were, shall now compare the country round Rome with the country round Edinburgh, will be able to form some judgment as to the tendency of Papal domination. The descent of Spain, once the first among monarchies, to the lowest depths of degradation, the elevation of Holland, in spite of many natural disadvantages, to a position such as no commonwealth so small has ever reached, teach the same lesson. Whoever passes in Germany from a Roman Catholic to a Protestant principality, in Switzerland from a Roman Catholic to a Protestant canton, in Ireland from a Roman Catholic to a Protestant county, finds that he has passed from a lower to a higher grade of civilization. On the other side of the Atlantic the same law prevails. The Protestants of the United States have left far behind them the Roman Catholics of Mexico, Peru and Brazil. The Roman Catholics of Lower Canada remain inert, while the whole continent round them is in a ferment with Protestant activity and enterprise. The French have doubtless shown an energy and an intelligence which,



even when misdirected, have justly entitled them to be called a great people. But this apparent exception, when examined, will be found to confirm the rule; for in no country that is called Roman Catholic has the Roman Catholic Church, during several generations, possessed so little authority as in France."

Victor Hugo wrote to the same effect:

### **Victor Hugo on the Papacy**

No nation has known more intimately the power and effect of the Papacy than France. Hear what Victor Hugo said of the influence of Rome:

"And you claim the liberty of teaching. Stop! be sincere; let us understand the liberty which you claim. It is the liberty of not teaching. You wish us to give you the people to instruct. Very well. Let us see your pupils. Let us see those you produced. What have you done for Italy? What have you done for Spain? For centuries you have kept in your hands, at your discretion, at your school, these two great nations, illustrious among the illustrious. What have you done for them? I shall tell you. Thanks to you, Italy, whose name no man who thinks can any longer pronounce without inexpressible filial emotions — Italy, mother of genius and of nations, which has spread over all the universe all the most brilliant marvels of poetry and arts, Italy—which has taught mankind to read—now knows not how to read! Yes, Italy is of all the states of Europe, that where the smallest number know how to read! Spain, magnificently endowed Spain, which received from the Romans her first civilization; from the Arabs her second civilization; from Providence and in spite of you, a world America—Spain, thanks to you, a yoke of stupor, which is a yoke of degradation and decay; Spain has lost this secret power which it had from the Romans; this genius of art which it had from the Arabs; this world which it had from God, and in exchange for all you have made it lose, it has received from you the Inquisition—the Inquisition, which certain men of the party tried to-day to re-establish; which has burned on the funeral pile millions of men; the Inqui-

tion which disinterred the dead to burn them as heretics; which declared the children of heretics infamous and incapable of any public honors, excepting only those who shall have denounced their fathers; the Inquisition, which, while I speak, still holds in the Papal library the manuscripts of Galileo sealed under the Papal signet. These are your masterpieces. This fire which we call Italy you have extinguished. This colossus that we call Spain you have undermined—the one in ashes, the other in ruins. This is what you have done for two great nations. What do you wish to do for France? Stop! you have just come from Rome! I congratulate you, you have had fine success there. You came from gagging the Roman people, and now you wish to gag the French people. I understand. This attempt is still more fine, but take care, it is dangerous. France is a lion, and is still alive!”

### **R.C. Church Similarly Campaigning Secretly or Openly Everywhere**

It may be instructive to observe that the Roman Hierarchy's efforts in respect to the Norwood Public School is symptomatic of its efforts everywhere. As soon as it became known that I was to speak on this subject in Winnipeg, I received a pamphlet from California. I print it in this address:

### **LETTER FROM CALIFORNIA**

***“ONCE AGAIN CALIFORNIA VOTERS MUST DEFEAT AN ATTEMPT TO DESTROY A GREAT PRINCIPLE.*** That principle was upheld in the State Elections of 1926 and 1933. Because we adopted in good faith the 1944 Welfare Amendment to the California Constitution, which now appears to have been conceived and sponsored with premeditated guile, the public has been betrayed.

“The Legislature in its last session, *unmindful of promises made to the voters* and under “authority” of that Welfare Amendment, passed Assembly Bill 3383 which extends an indirect subsidy by exempting certain private and religious school properties from taxation.

"Under the coercion of a powerful lobby, this bill was "blitzed" to adoption. The representatives of those who have opposed this exemption for twenty-five years were allowed ten minutes to express that opposition.

"Fortunately, men and women who understood the consequences of this exemption immediately started a referendum. *Thousands of citizens cooperated to obtain 326,010 signatures despite a well-organized and viciously conducted campaign of vilification, vituperation, coercion, boycott and personal violence.* It was designed not to inform the voters on the issue, but rather to intimidate the circulators and deny the people their right to vote on the issue.

*"The referendum has qualified for the next State election.*

"*ONE RELIGIOUS ORGANIZATION* is and always has been conspicuous in this constant fight to use public tax money for support of its school system, a system which subordinates education to religious instruction and the propagation of one faith to the exclusion of all others. That organization is the Roman Catholic Church which, through its *California Hierarchy*, is obeying the orders of the Roman Pope.

"*THIS IS NOT A RELIGIOUS FIGHT.* Protestants and other religious groups are not contending here with Roman Catholic laymen, involving as it would valued personal friendships. Many American Roman Catholics deplore the political activities of the Hierarchy with its threatened disruption of community relationships. It is not a question of the right of religious groups to conduct their own private schools, nor is it an attack upon these schools. It is a battle for American Constitutional principles . . . a battle against the continuing purposes of the Roman Catholic Hierarchy to attain political power through the eventual control of all education by the diversion of *public money* for the support of their own parochial school system now.

"*Why all this desperate, frenzied effort to control education?* For that answer one must look to the maior

premises of Roman Catholic Dogma: "The only True Church" and "One representative of God on Earth"—The Roman Pope and he infallible, demanding and receiving unquestioning obedience from his disciplined Cardinals, Archbishops, Bishops, Priests and Nuns alike. For the Hierarchy there can be no static position, no middle ground, no compromise. Their objective has been and must be the ultimate complete obedience of every human on earth to the Roman Catholic Church and to the Roman Pope. They must by any and all means incessantly strive to that end or deny the fundamental precepts of their faith.

*"BUT WHY THE EMPHASIS ON A SCHOOL SYSTEM?* This is a battle for the minds of men. Whoever controls and brings into disciplined obedience the minds of children will eventually control the minds of men, and through them dominate the governments men constitute. The Roman Catholic school system is the foundation, the hard core of Catholic discipline and obedience.

*"The orders of the Pope* place the California Hierarchy in a desperate situation. The inescapable financial obligations for annual operating expenditures, and the costs of additional school property necessary to elevate the Roman Catholic school system to a predominant position in California education are far beyond present resources of the Roman Catholic Church, rich as it is, unless they can cut in on Public School tax funds. Hence, the constant drive of the Hierarchy for *tax exemption now and eventual complete support of Roman Catholic schools.*

*"TAX EXEMPTION IS THEIR FIRST STEP! . . .* The Roman Catholic Hierarchy must obtain public tax support if it is to expand its educational system to a position of predominance. Tax exemption of parochial school properties is their first step. *Establish the "justice" of this principle and the Hierarchy will press for more and more "justice" . . . from free bus transporta-*

tion to complete tax support. Just give them this one advantage and *time!*

**"TAX EXEMPTION IS A SUBSIDY.** Let them not confuse the issue. Whether we exempt or fail to collect a tax dollar on the one hand, or whether we collect that tax dollar and later give it as a direct subsidy, the end result is the same. Both are subsidies.

"We are talking here of city and county real property taxes for fire, police, health, and traffic facilities. Schools make extraordinary demands for these services, and rightly so. The fact remains, however, that where the costs of these services are exempted to one property they must be assumed by the owners of all other properties not so favored. We are not concerned with justifying existing tax exemptions. The coming election does not involve them. Our concern is to prevent the forcing of taxpayers who are not Roman Catholics to subsidize the Roman Catholic school system.

**"AS THE ROMAN CATHOLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM** sustains the whole structure of Roman Catholic discipline, so the American Free Public School system is the rock upon which rests the whole structure of individual freedom and free institutions in America.

**"LISTEN TO THE VOICES OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC HIERARCHY!** To attain the predominant position they seek for their Catholic school system the Hierarchy must discredit and impair, if not destroy, the Public school. This is in process to-day. Hard to believe? Listen:

*"Our first duty to the public school is not to pay taxes for its maintenance . . . a system which we conscientiously hold to be bad in principle and bad in its ultimate consequences."*<sup>1</sup>

*"This sacred fetish of academic freedom . . . the soft underbelly of our American way of life."*<sup>2</sup>

*"That the Catholic and non-Catholic school systems are absolutely irreconcilable is an indisputable fact."*<sup>3</sup>

*"Public Enemy No. 1—Education Without Religion."*<sup>1</sup>

*"Education is not the function of the State."*<sup>2</sup>

*"... education belongs pre-eminently to the Church . . . the Church is independent of earthly sovereignty both in origin and the exercise of its educational mission, not only with respect to its specific aim, but also with respect to the means necessary to achieve it . . . As for the scope of the Church's educative mission, it extends over all peoples without any limitation."*<sup>3</sup>

*"THE AMERICAN PEOPLE HAVE BEEN COMMITTED for more than a hundred years to the principle that every child has the right to an adequate education at public cost. No private organization has ever been asked to relieve us of any part of that responsibility nor is the Roman Catholic system, in particular, established to afford such relief. It is simple justice that if any organization requires private schools for its own private purposes that organization should pay for them. If the costs they voluntarily assume in the maintenance of their schools do not justify the ends they seek, then they are free to discontinue their schools and educate their children at public expense.*

*"THIS IS A BATTLE THAT IS BEING WAGED NOW! We have succeeded through the referendum in holding up this tax exemption until the next State election. The enraged Roman Hierarchy has started a costly campaign to indoctrinate the voters with "plausible" parochial school arguments. They have hired professionals to secure the support of civic and other organizations in the same manner that the support of the Legislature was obtained. They are exerting pressures*

---

<sup>1</sup>Father Paul L. Blakley, S. J. "May an American Oppose the Public School?" <sup>2</sup>Father Hunter Guthrie, President, Georgetown University. <sup>3</sup>Editorial statement in Jesuit Magazine AMERICA.

<sup>4</sup>Bishop John F. Noll. "Our National Enemy No. 1—Education Without Religion." <sup>5</sup>J. Francis McIntyre, Archbishop of Los Angeles.

<sup>6</sup>Encyclical Letter of Pope Pius XI on Education (Jan. 16, 1930).

to force a *special election* before our own campaign can be organized and financed.

***"WE MUST RAISE IMMEDIATE FUNDS*** to counteract their propaganda now and be ready to carry the campaign to the voters through radio, newspapers, billboards and direct mail. We must defeat this latest tax grab at the polls. We must fight to protect the California Public School system—now!

***"ONCE AGAIN CALIFORNIA VOTERS MUST VOTE "NO" TO PRESERVE A GREAT PRINCIPLE.***

### **A PETITION OF 326,010 VOTERS**

It will be noticed that the people of Los Angeles rolled up a petition with 326,010 signatures, which compelled the State Legislature to order a Referendum on the subject. Protestants, or to use a broader term, the non-Catholics, not only of Winnipeg, but of the Province of Manitoba, should immediately circulate a petition restricting the signatures to those who are taxpayers, and accredited voters, and to make that petition so large that it will compel the Manitoba Legislature to disallow the Norwood Public School Act; or otherwise to order a Referendum on the principle of integrating Separate Schools into the Public School System, as has been done in Norwood, so that the voters of the whole Province may have an opportunity to speak. Your Manitoba Government would almost certainly refuse to take either action, unless they are faced with such an overwhelming signed protest by the voters of the Province.

### **Special Danger in Western Canada**

And I direct your attention to the special danger to which Western Canada is now exposed.

The Roman Catholic Church, by its support of Hitler, and his Allies, in the war, has been utterly discredited in Europe; and its revenue, jointly by the loss of confidence it has incurred, and by the poverty and disability consequent upon its action, imposed upon its former supporters, has been greatly reduced. It is now desperately trying to recoup its losses in other parts of the world, and particularly in North America, in the United States and Canada.

An article in *Life* magazine recently pictured Canada as potentially one of the richest countries in the world. With this statement we all agree. But what has that to do with the Roman Church? Hundreds of thousands of displaced persons in Europe are Roman Catholics. The Hierarchy is carefully controlling immigration by a selective process; and so far as it has power, it will establish cells of Roman Catholic influence all over Canada, and particularly in the Western Provinces. The very foundation of this programme is the Separate School. (In Ontario they are actually setting up dummy schools, and claiming support for them). They will then bring these displaced persons, and other immigrants from Roman Catholic countries, including Britain — don't forget there are Roman Catholics in Britain — and they will establish them in colonies with a Separate School, and a church, and the priest's residence, and all the other things necessary to Roman Catholic propaganda. It would be bad enough if they were willing to pay for these special privileges. For even if Roman Catholics paid for their Separate Schools they would still be a disintegrating and destructive force in our national life. But it is still worse when they are established in such a way that the Hierarchy cunningly devises means to compel the Protestant population to pay for them. It is like asking a man to pay for an axe to cut off his own head. Every Roman Catholic Separate School is an atomic bomb, threatening the disunity of the community and the nation.

### **How Is This Being Accomplished?**

I come now to ask how this is being accomplished? Are not Protestants in the majority in this country? Most certainly they are. If the non-Catholics of this country were people of principle, who would stand out boldly against this infringement upon their liberties, Roman Catholic aggression could soon be terminated.

### **"Politicians" and "Statesmen"**

We have large numbers of politicians in our Provincial Legislatures, and in the Dominion House of Commons;



but we have very few statesmen. A politician is a man who lives and shapes his course with a view to its effect upon the next election, whether it be his first, or a subsequent election. What he wants is votes and his indemnity. The Roman Catholic priest is able to deliver votes in job lots — blocks of a thousand or more votes may be guaranteed on condition the politician promises to serve the Roman Church if and when he is elected.

The non-Catholic is dependent upon individual votes. Thus the highly organized Roman Catholic minority is defeating the Protestant majority, and absolutely rules this country.

A statesman is a man who accepts public office as a solemn responsibility, and feels it his duty to use his very best judgment to secure legislation which will promote the interests of the present and future generations.

### **Only One Way to Stop It**

I know of no means by which Roman Catholic aggression can be stopped but by changing the minds and the hearts of individual voters. True, there are some who are anything but Protestant in the honourable, historic, significance of that term: they are mere anti-Papists, and perhaps such as they are, they may be depended upon to resist Roman Catholic aggression, more especially when it costs them nothing but a lot of anti-popery talk. *But to win this battle Protestants must be Protestants indeed.* Their political, and social, and economic conduct must be regulated by Biblical principles, and energized by a Divine Power. In other words, what this country needs more than anything else is a great religious awakening, which will so change the hearts of the multitudes as it did in the Wesley Revival, that they will stand uncompromisingly against all the machinations of Antichrist. That is to say, in heart, and life, by which I mean in all spheres of life, Protestants must be so taught in the Word of God, and so possessed by the Holy Ghost, that they will put Christ first, and stand uncompromisingly against all that belongs to the Devil, and particularly to his chief agent, known as the Pope.

### **A Province-Wide Petition**

I therefore suggest a Province-wide petition such as I have named; and that then all the interests of life be subordinated to the claims of Jesus Christ, that we may make this great nation in the truest sense a Christian nation. Then it will be, above all others, a glorious land of liberty and prosperity. And in order that this may be, let us emulate the example of Martin Luther, and taking our stand for the truth of God, and for the freedom of the nation, declare: "Here I stand; I can do no other, so help me God!"

---

## C. ERIC KASTNER

The first part of the book is devoted to a general introduction to the theory of the firm. The author discusses the various ways in which the firm is defined, and the different ways in which it is organized. He then goes on to discuss the various ways in which the firm is financed, and the different ways in which it is managed. The second part of the book is devoted to a detailed discussion of the theory of the firm. The author discusses the various ways in which the firm is defined, and the different ways in which it is organized. He then goes on to discuss the various ways in which the firm is financed, and the different ways in which it is managed. The third part of the book is devoted to a detailed discussion of the theory of the firm. The author discusses the various ways in which the firm is defined, and the different ways in which it is organized. He then goes on to discuss the various ways in which the firm is financed, and the different ways in which it is managed. The fourth part of the book is devoted to a detailed discussion of the theory of the firm. The author discusses the various ways in which the firm is defined, and the different ways in which it is organized. He then goes on to discuss the various ways in which the firm is financed, and the different ways in which it is managed. The fifth part of the book is devoted to a detailed discussion of the theory of the firm. The author discusses the various ways in which the firm is defined, and the different ways in which it is organized. He then goes on to discuss the various ways in which the firm is financed, and the different ways in which it is managed. The sixth part of the book is devoted to a detailed discussion of the theory of the firm. The author discusses the various ways in which the firm is defined, and the different ways in which it is organized. He then goes on to discuss the various ways in which the firm is financed, and the different ways in which it is managed. The seventh part of the book is devoted to a detailed discussion of the theory of the firm. The author discusses the various ways in which the firm is defined, and the different ways in which it is organized. He then goes on to discuss the various ways in which the firm is financed, and the different ways in which it is managed. The eighth part of the book is devoted to a detailed discussion of the theory of the firm. The author discusses the various ways in which the firm is defined, and the different ways in which it is organized. He then goes on to discuss the various ways in which the firm is financed, and the different ways in which it is managed. The ninth part of the book is devoted to a detailed discussion of the theory of the firm. The author discusses the various ways in which the firm is defined, and the different ways in which it is organized. He then goes on to discuss the various ways in which the firm is financed, and the different ways in which it is managed. The tenth part of the book is devoted to a detailed discussion of the theory of the firm. The author discusses the various ways in which the firm is defined, and the different ways in which it is organized. He then goes on to discuss the various ways in which the firm is financed, and the different ways in which it is managed.

Copyright © 1999 by C. Eric Kastner  
All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher.

# The Gospel Witness and Protestant Advocate

T. T. SHIELDS, EDITOR

Issued Every Thursday, \$3.00 per Year

130 Gerrard St. East - - Toronto 2, Canada

---

**T**HE GOSPEL WITNESS is the only distinctively weekly Protestant paper in Canada. It fearlessly exposes the machinations and aggressions of the Roman Catholic Church the world over. It publishes translations of the French-language press, which no other English-language paper dares to expose to the view of its readers. It has been frequently discussed in the House of Commons, in the Quebec Legislature, in the Ontario Legislature; and is denounced by all the Roman Catholic press of the country. No Protestant desiring to have an understanding of the times can afford to be without it.

Before the war this paper circulated in sixty different countries. Every issue contains a sermon, electrically recorded, as preached in Jarvis Street Church carrying with it the atmosphere of a great service. The sermons are translated into many different languages, and are reproduced week by week, or month by month, in many other periodicals.

We have many hundreds of ministers on our subscription list, many of whom take the paper for the sake of the sermon, and particularly for the value of the illustrations.

Your annual subscription is solicited.

Published by "The Gospel Witness and Protestant Advocate"  
130 Gerrard Street East, Toronto 2, Canada

(Copies of this address may be obtained directly, or by mail, post paid, at 25c per copy. This charge is merely to cover the cost of publication.)